

caucuses, we will be, of course, voting on this amendment. I think, from our perspective, this has been a real effort at trying to reach a bipartisan agreement. We have Republican cosponsors and we have Democratic cosponsors of this effort. It is an effort to try to achieve a partnership between the States and the Federal Government.

The States should be required to participate. The Federal Government is required to participate. When savings are achieved, which they will be, both sides should benefit from those savings. When States spend less money because they have fewer people on the welfare rolls, the Federal Government should have to contribute less money, not the same amount. That is why our amendment clearly is scored by the Congressional Budget Office as saving \$545 million over the next 7 years. Those are important savings. Without my amendment, they will not be achieved.

I think this amendment continues the participation that we have had, allows the States to be inventive as to different types of programs they come up with, but requires them to participate. The Federal Government should not have to pay 100 percent of the cost of welfare. The States should participate, and jointly, together, we can produce a better result.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the remainder of our time.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2488

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 4 minutes of debate equally divided on the Breaux amendment No. 2488.

Who yields time?

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I think we had a good debate on the maintenance of effort provision. I think it boils down to simply this. If you want a welfare reform bill to come out of the Senate that is going to be an impetus for change, it is going to say to the States to go out there and be innovative and be able to reduce the welfare caseload, reduce the amount of State expenditures, and have the flexibility you need to do those without artificially holding States to the high level of maintenance of effort. I think

the Dole 75 percent provision that is in there right now does that. It prohibits a race to the bottom. It gives States flexibility. It says be innovative. It saves money. And I think that is really what we want to accomplish. It is a prevention of the worst-case scenario which is no welfare spending from the States, and at the same time provides that amount of flexibility that is needed to go forward and do some dramatic changes in the welfare system. I think we have struck a very responsible compromise.

I think this amendment goes too far. This basically says we are going to continue to spend money. The Senator from Louisiana often says we are going to save money at the Federal level. Why should not the Federal Government save money? We may be saving money on the Federal level but we are spending a lot more taxpayers' money at the State level. The taxpayer overall under this amendment will lose even though the Federal Government is going to save a little money. It will spend a lot more in State resources. Again, it is an unfriendly taxpayer amendment and at the same time stifles innovation.

I urge the rejection of the amendment.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I will conclude my remarks by pointing out that for 6 years we have had a partnership between the Federal Government and the States. The House, when they took up welfare reform, said for the first time the States will have no obligation to do anything. They can spend zero dollars if they want. But the Federal Government has to continue to foot 100 percent of the bill. That is wrong.

My amendment says we are going to require the States to spend 90 percent of what they were spending and the Federal Government will spend 100 percent of what it was spending. But if the States are able to reduce what they spend below 90 percent, we will also reduce the Federal contribution. If they save a dollar, we will save a dollar. That is a true partnership. They can be as inventive as they want. We hope they are. We hope they save money. But when they save money and spend more than 10 percent less than they were spending last year, the Federal Government will also reduce our contribution.

The Congressional Budget Office looked at our amendment and the Congressional Budget Office said that it would save \$545 billion over the next 7 years. Without my amendment being adopted, we will not see those savings implemented into law. Mr. President, \$545 billion over 7 years is a significant amount of money. It maintains the partnership between the Federal Government and the States. Why should we in Washington send the money to the States if they are not going to participate? If we let the States get off the hook and we continue to send the money, that is not a true partnership

and that will be contrary to the reforms that we are trying to reach. Anybody who has ever been to a conference around here knows the House has a zero requirement. If we go in with a 75 percent requirement, in all likelihood we are going to split the difference.

So if all of our Republican colleagues think 75 percent is a reasonable amount to come out of a conference, I would suggest it is absolutely essential that they vote for the Breaux amendment as it currently is drafted.

I yield the time.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I move to table the Breaux amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 411 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Abraham	Gorton	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gramm	Murkowski
Bennett	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Packwood
Brown	Gregg	Pressler
Burns	Hatch	Roth
Campbell	Hatfield	Santorum
Chafee	Helms	Shelby
Coats	Hutchison	Simpson
Coverdell	Inhofe	Smith
Craig	Kassebaum	Specter
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Stevens
DeWine	Kyl	Thomas
Dole	Lott	Thompson
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Faircloth	Mack	Warner
Frist	McCain	

NAYS—49

Akaka	Feinstein	Lieberman
Baucus	Ford	Mikulski
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Bradley	Heflin	Nunn
Breaux	Hollings	Pell
Bryan	Inouye	Pryor
Bumpers	Jeffords	Reid
Byrd	Johnston	Robb
Cohen	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kerry	Simon
Dodd	Kohl	Snowe
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Exon	Leahy	
Feingold	Levin	

NOT VOTING—1

Cochran

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2562

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the Senate will now consider amendment No. 2562, offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr.

ASHCROFT]. There will be 1 hour for debate equally divided.

The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

(Mr. COATS assumed the chair.)

Mr. ASHCROFT. Thank you, Mr. President. I yield myself 10 minutes, and I ask to be notified when the 10 minutes has expired.

Mr. President, we are debating this week a very important topic, and it is not the future of a series of governmental programs, not the role of the Federal Government in providing for a social safety net. We are not debating how much money we will save. What we are debating this week is nothing less than the lives of millions of American citizens.

The welfare program, as it is currently constituted, has entrapped millions of Americans and has robbed literally generations of their future. What we are debating is whether we will continue to subsidize the current system, which may feed the body, but it numbs the spirit. It is a system which traps people in a web of dependency, places them in a cycle of hopelessness and despair. It is a system which promises a way out, but punishes those who try to find the way out.

Today's welfare system is heartless and cruel; it is unfeeling, it is uncaring. Whatever we do, we must remember those facts, and we must remember the faces that are the portraits of suffering that have been drawn on the canvas of American history by our welfare system as it is now constituted.

Welfare's failure is evident in many programs. Nowhere is it more evident, though, than in the Food Stamp Program. Food stamps, part of the Great Society's war on poverty. Today, food stamps is the country's largest provider of food aid. It is also, arguably, the Nation's most extensive welfare program. Last year, the program tried to help more than one out of every 10 Americans at a cost of nearly \$25 billion.

As the chart behind me illustrates, spending on food stamps has increased exponentially since becoming a national program in the early seventies, a quite dramatic and rapid increase. It has not been a function of population growth alone. This expansion is the result of fraud and abuse, compounded by oversight, as well as a variety of other factors.

This stack of papers in front of me on the desk to my left is a stack of the 900 pages of food stamp regulations that States are forced to comply with in trying to help individuals find their way to independence and out of the despair of the welfare trap.

It is important to note that we have tried to reform welfare on previous occasions and tried to reform food stamps, as well, in the process.

The last real attempt at reform was in 1988, and you do not have to have particularly strong analytic skills to

see what has happened since 1988 in the food stamp program: The program has skyrocketed.

A 1995 General Accounting Office report, a 1995 GAO report, found through fraud and illegal trafficking in food stamps, the taxpayers lost as much as \$2 billion a year. Mr. President, \$2 billion a year is a lot of money. That would average out to \$40 million per State. That is close to \$800,000 a week, per State, all across this country.

Furthermore, despite GAO's conclusions that the resources allocated for monitoring retailers was grossly inadequate, in other words we have not had the kind of enforcement that GAO says might be appropriate, the Food and Consumer Service officials still uncovered 902 retailers involved in food stamp fraud last year alone. That is where food stamps, which are designed to help people with nutritional needs, are used to acquire any number of other things that are not part of the design for food stamps.

In February 1994, the Reader's Digest chronicled fraud and abuse in an article entitled the "Food Stamp Racket." One example was Kenneth Coats, no relation to the occupant of the chair I am sure, but owner of Coats Market in East St. Louis. It seems Mr. Coats paid as little as 65 cents on the dollar for food stamps and then cashed them in at full value.

During a period of 18 months he redeemed \$1.3 million, enabling him to pay for his children's private schooling, with enough left over for \$150,000 in stocks, five rental houses and a Mercedes.

If that were not bad enough, Reader's Digest reported that this was not Mr. Coats' first attempt at defrauding the American taxpayers. Ten years earlier his market was disqualified from participating in the Food Stamp Program because of fraud, though he was only disqualified for 6 months. Obviously, he was back in business. And at 65 cents, paying welfare recipients and cashing them in with the Government at obviously the face value, he made quite a bit of money.

Now, there are stories of food stamp fraud and abuse to be found in every State in the Nation. There is a lot to like about the Food Stamp Program but there are many ways in which this so-called ideal transitional benefit has been a problem. They are a stopgap measure. They serve the people. They serve children. They serve the elderly.

But there is a lot to dislike about the program which we have already discussed. It is because we want to change this system to help people and to empower States that I am today introducing this amendment.

Mr. President, we can do better. My amendment would fundamentally change food stamps. Instead of having a system run and administered by bureaucrats in Washington, my amendment would return responsibility for the Food Stamp Program to the States. It would do it with an impor-

tant qualifier: It would do it still allowing funding for growth at the CBO projected levels for the next 5 years.

Unlike the present system, however, this block grant would give the States an incentive to improve the program's performance and efficiency. It would accomplish this by allowing any and all savings achieved by the States to be applied to help more people who are really in need.

This approach, if adopted, would have enormous advantages. One, it would allow States to spend available resources on the people who need food, rather than on feeding the bureaucracy. It would make it possible to reduce some of the costs. The highest administrative costs in welfare, 12 percent, are in the Food Stamp Program.

Second, it would allow the States to coordinate their efforts in assisting the needy. So much of the problem we have now is when we shift welfare burdens from one quadrant of the welfare equation to another.

The leadership's bill would maintain many of the complicated regulations which have frustrated State efforts to help individuals in need. I think we need to give States the flexibility to administer need in accordance with the needs of the needy and the State rather than in accordance with the 900 pages of Federal regulations.

Third, a clean block grant to the States will work to end the fraud and abuse which have cost the taxpayers billions. I think this is so because when the State has a block grant and it reduces fraud and abuse, it gets to keep the money which has been involved in the fraud or abuse.

There will be a real incentive for the States to drive down the costs associated with fraud and abuse. It is true that the leadership bill in this measure has some incentives but they are not incentives which would thoroughly match the incentives of a block grant, the structural incentives of providing for savings and allowing the States to recoup the savings in their entirety.

Finally, States can provide individualized assistance. They know their welfare recipients' needs. They can coordinate thoroughly on their own terms their welfare programs.

We have real welfare reform. It is time for us to understand that reforming this, the largest of the welfare programs which touches more people than any others, should be a part of that reform.

We have heard a lot about devolution, that term that means we need to reduce the size and scope of the power of Washington. Well, we need to change the way in which Washington has affected the welfare system by stopping the arrogant assumption that Washington knows best, particularly in such a significant program. Every American has had an experience at some time or another with the abuses that are involved in food stamps. Federalism has one of its hallmarks of trusting Government close to the people. It is time

for us to do that with the Food Stamp Program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has spoken for 10 minutes. I believe he wanted to be notified.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I thank the Chair. I yield myself such additional time I may need to conclude my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ASHCROFT. A vote for this amendment is a clear and principled stand for the limits of the Federal power and the need for State control.

A vote against this amendment is also clear. It is a clear statement against the rights of people to control their own destinies, their own lives, in a way that is free from the intermeddling of nearly 1,000 pages of regulation, micromanaging what happens in States, interfering with their ability to meet the needs of their citizens.

We are in the midst of a long and substantial debate. It is a necessary debate on welfare. Passions are high. Rhetoric is high. Progress is slow. It is time for us to make real progress on a major welfare program.

Every so-called welfare reform for the past two generations has had a couple of things in common. They have resulted in more people being trapped in the web of dependency; and second, they have resulted in more bureaucracy. We need not rearrange the deck chairs on the welfare bureaucracy again. We need to make substantial changes. We cannot afford half measures. The poor cannot afford half measures.

We are about to fundamentally change AFDC. We are about to fundamentally change a number of other smaller welfare programs. It seems we are just happy to tinker around the margins with food stamps.

I believe food stamps are welfare. They are the largest—they serve more clients than any other welfare program. They provide an incentive to illegitimacy, just as AFDC does, by providing more payments with more children that are brought into this world while on welfare. They are a part and parcel of the welfare system which seeks to help but actually hurts.

I do not know how it is that block grants can make sense for everything else from AFDC to job training but not for food stamps.

Yet, given all this, the leadership bill makes involvement in the food stamp block grant optional while simultaneously creating a disincentive for individual States to choose to operate under the block grant.

By removing Federal entanglement, it is my hope we can begin to eliminate the fraud, cut down on waste, the high administrative costs, and make it possible for States to take action which helps move people from welfare to work.

If we succeed where others have failed, we must be bold and consistent.

I do not think we need to wait 7 years to determine whether a food stamp block grant is desirable. Washington's one-size-fits-all system has not worked. Continuing a system that entraps people in dependency will do nothing more than to sow the seeds of future disaster.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. LUGAR. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator as much time as he requires.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished manager and chairman.

I have listened to the speech of my distinguished colleague from Missouri, and if this indeed was simply a question of whether the States could make the decisions or not, it would be one thing, but it is not. In fact, it is quite the opposite. Under the bill of the distinguished Republican leader, the States have the right to make a decision—a decision to choose to take a block grant instead of food stamps, or to participate in the Food Stamp Program. The amendment, No. 2562, by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, removes that right.

I think, also, it removes an option available to many of the elderly and disabled. If somebody has received 24 months of assistance in their lifetime, then food stamps can no longer be made available unless they are working. We see where, if somebody has had assistance years before, worked many, many years before becoming disabled, they are told "You got your bite of the apple a long time ago." They lose their food assistance under this amendment. States no longer have the option, under this amendment, of choosing a block grant instead of food stamps, and participating in the Food Stamp Program.

The bill does impose on States, whether they want it or not, an unfair formula for providing funds. If you look at the formula, it penalizes growth States but also penalizes States that face recessions. During the last recession, when millions of people lost their jobs, they turned to food stamps to help feed their children. Under this amendment, when there is a recession, then benefits would be cut. Just when a temporarily out of luck family would need assistance, the amendment says, "Too bad, have a hungry day." For example, if you are an industrial State and large manufacturing plants suddenly close, that is when this could cut in. It seems, when fewer people need food stamps, the benefits increase again.

Let me give an example. In California a couple of years ago, there was a massive earthquake. Mr. President, 40 percent of all the food stamps issued in California were issued in L.A. County for that month. Basically, what we would say under this is we are going to allow the people who lost everything they had in L.A. County because of the

earthquake to eat. But all the rest of the State is going to go hungry.

One of the things the Food Stamp Program is supposed to do is to help even out those kinds of peaks and valleys because the earthquake that occurs in California may be the hurricane that occurs in Florida or the recession that occurs in Illinois or the flood that occurs along the Mississippi or Missouri River.

So I think we should not eliminate the choice of whether States should decide to take the block grant. Congress should not impose that on them. There are a lot of decisions that Governors and legislators have to make, so I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment. It removes the State's right to decide, hurts the elderly and disabled, and hurts some States at the expense of the others.

I like the original Agriculture Committee bill written by Senator LUGAR. It gives the States plenty of flexibility. It does not abandon the Federal-State partnership.

We have worked for years, constantly, to improve aspects of the food stamp program. The bill I talked about before that I introduced, on electronics benefits transfer, will do that. We have tightened and limited eligibility. But in the only major power on Earth that can not only raise enough food to feed 250 million people but have food left over for export and for storage, I question whether we should tamper with the most basic program for feeding hungry people—the elderly, disabled, those temporarily out of a job.

There are those who rip off the system and we can nail them. We have laws to do that. But let us not say you are going to be removed. And let us not say this is something that encourages more babies. What are you going to say, that if we do not feed a hungry baby, if we cut off the food, that baby will suddenly go away? Are we saying do not have the baby, abort the child, or do something else? The fact of the matter is, a hungry child is a hungry child. That child does not make that decision to be hungry. That child does not make that decision to be born. Let us not think that child will go away if we simply cut the food stamps or any other benefits for them.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana for his courtesy and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an employee of the Congressional Research Service, Joe Richardson, be granted privilege of the floor during consideration of welfare reform legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his thoughtful debating comments. He has offered leadership in the

nutrition area throughout the entirety of the 19 years that I have served in this body.

Throughout that period of time, I have been deeply concerned about the Food Stamp Program for several reasons, and the distinguished Senator from Missouri has expanded on many of them. The Food Stamp Program, because it is a national program and an extraordinarily complex one dealing with myriad retail situations, has led to great fraud and abuse. That has been a concern of the Committee on Agriculture really throughout the entirety of the program. It has to be our concern today.

But I have also been deeply concerned about the Food Stamp Program because it is the basic safety net for nutrition for Americans. It is the stopper, in terms of people starving, in this country. We have known that. We have regretted its abuse on occasion, but we have cherished the thought that every American, in a country of abundance, would have a chance to eat. That is fundamental and that we must preserve.

The distinguished Senator from Missouri, the great Governor of his State, has been a fighter for the reinvigoration of federalism, and I share that idealism. As mayor of the city of Indianapolis, I was involved in the first wave of the new federalism with President Nixon. Program after program came to our city. We tried to demonstrate, I think with some success, that mayors and local officials, in addition to Governors and county officials, can handle most of the aspects of the internal workings of government in this United States best at the local level. Clearly, in the welfare reform debate we are now having, we are about to test out the proposition that we should give back to States and local governments authority to handle a great deal of difficult matters.

But in the case of the food stamp and nutrition programs, the House of Representatives and the Senate to date have said that there must be a safety net, basically, for eating, for nutrition—a safety net against starvation in this country. This is not an experimental situation in which, as the Senator from Missouri advocates, like it or not we send it back to the States and say to the Governors: "You are going to have to run it. You may not have asked for it. You may not wish to deal with it at all. But, by golly, you are going to have it and with exactly the same amount of money being spent now with a little bit of inflation rise per year. It does not matter whether the country is in recession or prosperity; it does not matter whether you have more people coming in. That is your tough luck. We are going to send it to you because we are tired of it and we do not want to spend any more money on it and we do not want to take the responsibility for it."

Mr. President, I believe that is an understandable attitude but, I hope, not

the attitude the Senate winds up with today. Because, for many thousands of Americans, that is likely to be a disastrous decision and Senators really have to consider and weigh on their consciences today the proposition, which is a very fundamental one, before us.

As the Senator from Vermont pointed out, we are not doing this amendment as a favor to Governors. As a matter of fact, most have not requested this responsibility. Most of the Governors coming into our committee have not wanted the responsibility. To give some impression that Governors all over the country are eager to grasp all of this is totally erroneous.

There are some very able Governors who want to run it, and my judgment is that they will run it very well. But we have had a good number of Governors who have said we are inundated by people. We are inundated by the economic cycle. Yet, here we debate on this floor today the thought that, like it or not, the States will simply have the Food Stamp Program, or, as a matter of fact, they may not have much of a program at all.

The Governors may decide, in fact, to use the money for something else. If you happen to be a citizen of one of those States, you are out of luck. We have said thus far, Mr. President, that if you are an American, if you are here in this country and you are unemployed, you are disabled and you have problems, there is at least a safety net. And we have been proud that has been the case.

Let me just say that the Committee on Agriculture, long before we got into the welfare debate, was involved in reform of food stamp discussions this year. We are also involved in a very serious budget problem. We are going to have a reconciliation bill shortly. By September 22, we must report from our committee \$48.4 billion of savings over a 7-year period of time.

Mr. President, we have identified \$30 billion of savings in the nutrition programs and most of that in the Food Stamp Program. The Committee on Agriculture has been diligent because we have tried to both reform the program and make certain it was less expensive even while retaining the basic safety net of the program. The House of Representatives has done a similar job.

Mr. President, I will point out that the Republican leadership welfare proposal we are now debating, as does the House bill, does not block grant the Food Stamp Program but makes dramatic changes in its structure. It greatly expands the States' administrative flexibility and ability to implement welfare reform initiatives. By allowing States to operate a State-designed simplified food stamp program for cash welfare recipients and have more control over a host of regular program rules, States are given the option of taking the food stamp assistance as a block grant.

So, Mr. President, if I am in error—and there are a host of Governors out there who have been eager to get this program, they are eager to have that option. They may be lined up at the door, but I have not seen the line. All I am saying is they have that option. If they do so, they must spend 80 percent of the money that the Federal Government is spending on food. The rest can be spent on employment and training programs and, up to 6 percent, on administration.

The citizens in their State will have to hope that those Governors and legislators, if they become involved in that decision—that is a very interesting question, Mr. President: What if there was a case in which State legislators allow the Governor alone to make such a decision? Should a decision as grave as this one be vested in a Governor to take an entire State off the Food Stamp Program irrevocably, a one-time decision from which there is no return without the legislature, without any check and balance within that State? Should the Governor, in fact, be prepared to terminate the program if that is his wish or her wish, as the case may be? Where is the democracy in that situation even while we are eager to shed this burden and move down the trail of devolution?

Let me say it is important that Senators know the reforms that were enacted by the Agriculture Committee and have been adopted by the leadership proposal. I cite not all of them but ones that I think are very important that Senators know are a part of this bill but would not be a part necessarily of any regime in any State that decided simply to block grant food stamps.

In this bill, we disqualify any adult who voluntarily quits a job or reduces work effort. We deny food stamps to able-bodied adults 18 to 50 without children who received food stamps for 6 months out of the previous 12 months without working or participating in a work program at least half time. Those are pretty stringent qualifications.

We ensure that food stamp benefits do not increase when a recipient's welfare benefits are reduced for failing to comply with other non-work-related welfare rules, such as the failure to get children immunized. States may also reduce food stamp allotments for up to 25 percent for failure to comply with other welfare programs rules. States may do that.

We allow in this bill States to disqualify an individual from food stamps for the period that they are disqualified from other public assistance programs for failure to perform an action required in the other program. For example, failure to comply with AFDC work requirements must trigger a food stamp disqualification. We establish mandatory minimum disqualification periods for violation of work rules, and States may adopt even longer disqualification periods and may permanently

disqualify a recipient for a third violation of a work rule—permanently disqualify.

We give States control over the Food Stamp Program for households composed entirely of AFDC members as long as Federal costs do not increase. States choose their AFDC rules, food stamp rules, or a combination to develop one standardized set of rules. States may do all of this under this bill.

Mr. President, if this is the case, a Senator might ask, why the objection to simply letting States do it all? Why not make it permissive? Why spell it out in a Federal bill? We do so to preserve a national safety net.

The leadership bill before us now that we are debating is not a bill that is very permissive. This is a bill that saves \$30 billion over 7 years. In almost every conceivable way, in the 106 pages which the Agriculture Committee put together, it tries to make certain that food stamp programs stay on the straight and narrow.

Perhaps State legislatures will want to replicate that. Perhaps legislatures want to borrow this intact and pass it as a State law. But if they do not, Mr. President, the Governor of that State is going to have a heck of a time administering food stamps. The provisions in the leadership bill come from a body of knowledge and experience over the years of how fraud and abuse occur, and it occurs in many, many ways, not easily discovered in a transition period of a few weeks during which time the States with or without enthusiasm take over the Food Stamp Program.

Mr. President, the overwhelming case for a rejection of this amendment finally comes back to the fact that none of us can foretell the future in a dynamic economy such as ours. We are a free country. Thank goodness. People can move from State to State, and they do so by the tens of millions every year.

Yet, Mr. President, we are in the process of about to lock in flat amounts to States for the duration of this experiment, an amount of money that will not be changed if that State has a huge number of new people coming into it for whatever reason.

Perhaps States may say, "Well, we will control that. We will simply abandon the Food Stamp Program. There is nothing attractive about our State. Why not let other States that have a food stamp program take care of persons who are disabled or suddenly unemployed, or infants and children or what have you? Why not let those States take care of them?"

Mr. President, people can pick and choose where to live by their migratory patterns in this country. Perhaps the idea of a safety net wherever it is, is not attractive to Senators or citizens. But I have not heard the case made on those grounds very frequently. And I would say furthermore that even if there were no changes in population in the country, clearly there are

changes every year in the economic cycle.

In my home State of Indiana in 1982—I was reminded of this as we were discussing another food stamp amendment yesterday—in Kokomo, IN, in Anderson, in Muncie, Indiana where there were large concentrations of auto workers at a time of great recession, the unemployment reached, in each of those cities, 20 percent. I would just say that kind of unemployment is massive, and it is horrible to witness. The Food Stamp Program was very important to those cities, very important to our State. Whoever was Governor of Indiana could not have anticipated in 1979 and 1980 or even 1981 that there would be 20-percent unemployment in those localities. There was no way anyone could have been wise enough to have prophesied that. But the Governor of Indiana was mighty pleased that in fact there was a safety net for nutrition in our country and in the State of Indiana at that point and that he was not responsible at that moment for facing a whole apparatus for administering the Food Stamp Program.

Our Governor did not assert that he was wiser than everybody in the country; that he could do it better. He knew the problems better in Kokomo. Of course, he did. But that would not have made a whit of difference in terms of the nutrition needs of people who were suddenly and massively unemployed in ways that were not going to be remedied very rapidly.

Mr. President, it is simply reckless in a country of great dynamic changes of population and in the economic cycle to throw away the safety net; and that is the issue here.

The Senator from Missouri, in intellectual fairness, has presented very squarely that his amendment is the end of the Federal safety net, the end of the Federal Food Stamp Program, and there are many who will rejoice in that and say good riddance; we should never have started this humanitarian effort to begin with.

I am not one of them, Mr. President. I am hopeful a majority of Senators do not join in that point of view either. Of course, we must reform, and I have listed 6 of possibly 50 very sizable, tough reforms. Of course, we have to downsize and, of course, we have to economize. And we are doing it with a vengeance; \$30 billion in 7 years for food stamp recipients, but, of course, we must have a safety net in a vast and complex country such as ours.

Mr. President, I yield and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ASHCROFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. May I inquire as to the remaining time on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has 16 minutes and 55 seconds, the Senator from Indiana has 7 minutes and 18 seconds.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I yield so much time as I might consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. The question we debate today is not whether or not there will be assistance to individuals who are in need. The question we debate today is whether or not that assistance will be delivered by State officials who are proximate to the problem or whether we are going to persist with a one-size-fits-all system in Washington, DC, which is characterized by the highest administrative costs of any welfare program, rampant fraud and abuse, and 900 pages of excessive Federal regulations. I have not proposed ending the ability of States to meet the needs of their people. I am proposing enhancing the ability of States to meet those needs.

The distinguished Senator from Vermont talked about the needs in the event of earthquakes, floods, or other natural disasters. And the distinguished Senator from Indiana, for whom I have great respect, talked about needs in times of recession. I believe those are needs, those are legitimate needs, those are times when people legitimately need assistance, and I believe that assistance can best be rendered if we ask those at the State level to effect those programs they can effect to provide delivery of the services.

I might point out that the proposed amendment does not diminish the funding available for food stamps. We took the CBO numbers, the projections under the Dole bill and said those would be the amount of the block grant.

This is not a debate over the amount of resources that will be available. This is a debate over whether that resource will continue to be delivered through a one-size-fits-all bureaucracy that has failed in Washington, DC, or whether we are going to empower States that have substantial ideas on what they can do to deliver this program.

Let me quote to you what Gerald Miller says, director of social services for Governor Engler in Michigan.

"Under a block grant," he said, "States could deliver services more cheaply and efficiently without cutting benefits." Miller contends that if the food stamp program remains unchanged, it will have to be cut to meet deficit reduction targets. If the food stamp program were to be made into a block grant," he said, "I don't know one Republican Governor who would cut benefits to one client.

The distinguished Senator from Indiana indicated that Republican Governors or Governors in general might not be in favor of these kinds of amendments. I am pleased to just say that I know of one Governor, Gov. Tommy Thompson, who is a leading Republican Governor and one of the leading proponents of welfare reform in the country. I have his letter dated September 11, 1995, which I will submit for the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
September 11, 1995.

Hon. JOHN ASHCROFT,
U.S. Senate, Senate Hart Building, Washington
DC.

Hon. RICHARD C. SHELBY,
U.S. Senate, Senate Hart Building, Washington
DC.

DEAR SENATORS ASHCROFT AND SHELBY: As I know you both agree, the welfare reform bill currently being considered, S. 1120, is a dramatic improvement over current law. Each of you has submitted amendments to this bill which allow for still greater flexibility in the use of food stamps in the form of block grants. The purpose of this letter is to support your efforts in this regard.

Senator Ashcroft's amendment allows the maximum level of state flexibility while preserving the anticipated level of federal financial support envisioned in the leadership bill. Senator Shelby's amendment would also allow for generous state flexibility while at the same time reducing federal expenditures on food stamps through anticipated improvements in state efficiency in managing the program.

I heartily endorse both of your efforts to increase the level of flexibility allowed in the management of the food stamp program. In addition, the transferability of funds from the food stamp block grant to the AFDC block grant, which is common to both your bills, is of critical importance to states like Wisconsin. We anticipate spending more on work programs and supports to work, such as child care, and less on unrestricted benefits. Therefore, we need this funding flexibility.

We fully support both of your efforts to improve the leadership bill to allow for more effective administration of the food stamp block grant.

Sincerely,

TOMMY G. THOMPSON,
Governor.

Mr. ASHCROFT. It is addressed to the Honorable RICHARD C. SHELBY of this body and to me. It endorses the effort to increase the flexibility for States in the Food Stamp Program and the block grant program.

Now, reference has been made to the safety net for nutrition; that we need to help citizens who are in real need; we need to deliver and meet that need effectively.

Reference has been made to the potential—and I do not understand this—of an irrevocable, one-time decision by Governors to abandon food help to their citizens. I do not know of any Governor that has that kind of authority, and I do not know of any government anywhere in the United States that can make irrevocable decisions to abandon things.

The political process operates. People with needs know their way to the State capital. It is easier to get there than it is to the National Capital. Welfare recipients have the right to vote. This body and the U.S. Congress in the last session provided a special means of registering welfare recipients so that they would be given a right to vote, their voice would be heard, making their voice heard in a place close to them, the State capital, instead of de-

manding that they come to Washington to have their voice heard, and demanding that they find their way through 900 pages of Federal regulations appears to me to be an important thing.

Let me just additionally say it was indicated no one has the ability to know what the future holds if we were to have a block grant to the States. I can tell you what the future holds if we do not block grant this to the States. The future holds the same kind of problems that we have had in the past with entitlement spending that continues to build the program. When the Federal program is an entitlement program, it is in the interest of the State to build the program. States administering the program without a financial stake in the program keep shifting people into the State automatically. It is part of the pernicious impact of this Federal system of welfare which has resulted in a growing portion of our population being dependent on Government rather than a shrinking portion of our population being dependent on Government.

It is a simple question. Do we want more welfare and less independence or do we want more independence and less welfare? The structure of the way we deliver benefits should not be designed to increase welfare as it is now. It should be designed to increase independence.

I believe the opportunity made available to the States of this country through a block grant so that States can formulate their own rules and they know they are operating within a limited amount of resources is exactly what we need. An entitlement system simply is absent the kind of incentive for reduction in the problem.

We need to reform welfare, not to grow it. People in my State, when they spell reform, spell it r-e-d-u-c-e, reduce. It is time for us to reduce welfare.

So with all due respect for my distinguished colleagues from Vermont and from Indiana, who have indicated that it is important to have an entitlement program that is open ended, I think it has the wrong structural incentives.

One last point that I would make. My respected and distinguished colleague from Vermont, Senator LEAHY, mentioned we could not consider this program to be an incentive for illegitimacy. I do not think it was designed to be an incentive for illegitimacy. But the fact of the matter is that the more children you have in the family, the bigger the benefits are. And in the context of a benefit that can be changed into cash with unfortunate and inappropriate ease, I think it is undeniable that we have simply exacerbated the problem.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LUGAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, let me just indicate again that the welfare reform bill in front of the Senate is not one that is permissive. It talks about reform and reduction, as the distinguished Senator from Missouri has pointed out. All of the requirements that I mentioned in the reform of food stamps are clearly not permissive. They do not permit a program that is open-ended. Quite to the contrary, they demand a program that reduces expenses by \$30 billion in 7 years of time, a program that is thoroughly conversant with fraud and abuse, as has been observed and will be discovered by States that attempt to run these complex programs. But, Mr. President, I have no quarrel with a Governor or a State that wishes to take over the Food Stamp Program. As a matter of fact, the bill in front of us permits that explicitly.

What I do think is inadvisable is for the Congress—or the Senate more particularly today—to simply say, whether you want the program or not, it is yours and you are going to have to deal with it, all of the regulations, all of the stipulations. And even if you are well motivated to serve those who are hungry, you are going to have to figure out from scratch how to do that and on a limited amount of money that will not increase whether the economic times change or the population changes. That I think, Mr. President, is ill-advised, and so do many others.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, Mr. President, letters from the Food Marketing Institute, from the National-American Wholesale Grocers' Association, the National Cattlemen's Association, and the National Peanut Council, Inc., that back the current proposals in the welfare bill that is before us and would oppose block-granting food stamp programs.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD MARKETING INSTITUTE,
Washington, DC, July 11, 1995.

Hon. RICHARD G. LUGAR,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LUGAR: The retail food industry full supports the efforts of this Congress to produce meaningful welfare reform that is simpler, more efficient and less costly than the current system. The food stamp program is one aspect of welfare reform that is of particular concern to our industry. We have been participating in this program for over twenty-five years and have long supported food stamps as an effective and efficient way of reducing hunger.

FMI supports the food stamp reforms approved by the Senate Agriculture Committee. The supermarket industry believes the Agriculture Committee bill allows state and local flexibility to create innovative programs while maintaining a system that guarantees allocated funding will be used for food assistance. Research has demonstrated that removing the link between program benefits and the actual purchase of food results in the deterioration of nutritional diets, especially for our children. Food assistance programs are different from other welfare programs—they are the basic safety

net for those who cannot afford adequate diets. We are concerned that converting the federal nutrition program into a cash program would inadvertently result in eliminating the current food stamp program and the long-term effects would be disastrous.

As the most effective way to curb fraud and abuse, FMI supports the conversion of paper food stamps to a nationally uniform EBT system. Without a uniform national delivery system, there is potential for different sets of standards and operational procedures all of which would make it impossible to set up an effective central monitoring system to detect fraud and abuse. Continued access for recipients in rural communities and urban centers is critically important as we move to implement a nationwide EBT system. We support modifications to the Agriculture Committee bill to assure that all EBT systems are compatible and available to the smallest, local community stores. This will allow recipients to retain the freedom to shop at stores of their choice without overly restricting state flexibility. A uniform delivery system is the best way to reduce cost and make this important domestic feeding program even better and more efficient. Current law also prohibits the government from shifting EBT program cost to retailers who are licensed to accept food stamps which would in effect eliminate many from participating in the program. We would oppose any efforts to eliminate that protection.

FMI pledges to work with you to achieve meaningful welfare reform. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that cashing out the food stamp program would be a disaster for needy families and their communities all across America. This is why we support the approach taken by the Senate Agriculture Committee.

The Food Marketing Institute (FMI) is a nonprofit association conducting programs in research, education, industry relations and public affairs on behalf of its 1,500 members including their subsidiaries—food retailers and wholesalers and their customers in the United States and around the world. FMI's domestic member companies operate approximately 21,000 retail food stores with a combined annual sales volume of \$220 billion—more than half of all grocery store sales in the United States. FMI's retail membership is composed of large multi-store chains, small regional firms and independent supermarkets. Its international membership includes 200 members from 60 countries.

Sincerely,

TIM HAMMONDS,
President and CEO.

THE FOOD DISTRIBUTORS ASSOCIATION,
September 12, 1995.

Hon. RICHARD LUGAR,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture,
Nutrition, and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LUGAR: The National-American Wholesale Grocers' Association and the International Foodservice Distributors Association (NAWGA/IFDA) supports the reform of our welfare system, including the significant reforms your Committee has recommended for the Food Stamp Program. However, we do not believe "cashing-out" the Food Stamp Program falls under the rubric of reform. NAWGA/IFDA is an international trade association comprised of food distribution companies which primarily supply and service independent grocers and foodservice operations throughout the U.S. and Canada.

We understand that several amendments may be offered in the coming days which would effectively cash-out the Food Stamp Program. NAWGA/IFDA respectfully urges the rejection of these amendments.

There is no conclusive evidence that cashing-out the Food Stamp Program would improve the delivery of welfare benefits. In fact, cash-out demonstration projects conducted by the Department of Agriculture have shown a five to eighteen percent decline in food expenditures. Although attractive because of its administrative simplicity, we do not believe that such a system could effectively serve food stamp recipients.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BURKE,
Vice President,
Government Affairs.

NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, February 14, 1995.

Hon. BILL EMERSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to convey the National Cattlemen's Association's recent grassroots policy decisions on Welfare Reform and specifically block granting federal food-assistance funds (H.R. 4). The National Cattlemen's Association, which is the national spokesperson for all segments of the U.S. beef cattle industry representing 230,000 cattle producers throughout the country, supports welfare reform by providing increased control to local government. Cattle producers have long supported the Commodity Distribution Program and other food assistance programs, as a means of providing nutritious foods to those in need in a cost effective manner. We believe it is time however, to review these programs and make appropriate changes to increase their efficiency and effectiveness.

In addition to overall themes of increasing state flexibility balancing the budget, the National Cattlemen's Association supports the following provisions in any welfare reform legislation:

Money designated for food stamp recipients must be spent on food only.

A commodity purchase group should continue within USDA to assist states in increasing their volume purchasing power, thus saving states money.

A means must be established to purchase non-price supported commodities when an over-supply situation occurs.

Third party verification to assure contractual performance.

Adequate nutritional standards for school lunch programs.

The National Cattlemen's Association supports efforts to control federal spending and decrease the size of the federal government. We would very much like to work with you to make these goals a reality. For further information, please contact Beth Johnson or Chandler Keys in our Washington office (202) 347-0228.

Sincerely,

SHERI SPADER,
Chairman, Food Policy Committee.

NATIONAL PEANUT COUNCIL, INC.,
Alexandria, VA, December 9, 1994.

Hon. RICHARD G. LUGAR,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LUGAR: We write to urge you in the strongest possible terms to oppose proposals, such as those included in the Pension Responsibility Act (PRA), to replace current federal food assistance programs with block grant funding. We oppose both the concept of block grant funding and the sharply reduced funding levels that have been proposed.

We oppose these proposals for the following reasons:

(1) The block grant approach fails to assure that federal dollars will go for their intended purposes. Under the PRA, large portions of federal funding for food assistance could be provided in cash. Specifically, the PRA

would allow benefits previously provided as food stamp and WIC coupons to instead be provided as cash. Thus, states would be free to provide assistance that could be devoted to other non-food needs. This approach could not only have a serious deleterious effect on low-income children and families but also could effect adversely the entire food and agriculture economy. In addition, the block grant converts nutrition programs from entitlements into discretionary programs subject to annual appropriations. Thus, there is no guarantee that any federal dollars will be available for food assistance.

(2) The block grant approach is inherently insensitive to the poor when their needs are greatest. There is no mechanism in block grants to assure assistance will expand during a recession or when need arises (such as a natural disaster). At the very time that needs go up in one state and potentially down in another, the funding will be inflexible and thus inefficiently applied to those states.

(3) The PRA would likely end the school lunch program as we know it. By proscribing assistance paid for meals served to "middle income" children, the likely result of the PRA is that millions of school children and thousands of schools will abandon the current system that guarantees free and reduced price meals to low-income children. Far smaller cutbacks in this subsidy in 1981 resulted in a loss of about 2,000 schools and two million children (750,000 low-income) from the program.

(4) The block grant approach removes from food assistance any tie to nutritional standards. Once states are free to design any program they want, there will be no assurance that the federal dollars are being spent consistent with fundamental standards on diet and health.

The block grant approach, especially with reduced funding levels, will result in more children in this country going hungry. Most of the programs affected are child nutrition programs, and half of all the participants of the largest nutrition program affected (food stamps) are children.

The resulting tremendous increase in need cannot be met by private charities. These institutions have repeatedly documented that they cannot meet the demand currently placed upon them. Furthermore, we strenuously object to any policy that could have the effect of an exponential increase in the number of Americans who must feed their families through soup kitchen and bread lines. This is no way for the greatest nation in the world to care for its needy residents.

Finally, we suggest that a return to block grants ignores the history of why federal food assistance programs were established. The federal government stepped in because states were either unable or unwilling to meet the needs of our people.

The federal nutrition programs are an enormous success story, built with bipartisan support from Congress over many years. Study after study has documented the effectiveness of the very programs that proposals like the PRA would turn back to the states. These programs have been proven to enhance the health and education of our children, some saving money in the long run. They also can serve as effective organizing tools for crime prevention.

Initial estimates indicate the PRA could reduce food assistance funding by about ten percent (\$4 to \$5 billion a year) from the projected \$40 billion FY 1996 food assistance funding level. Even this inadequate level would not be guaranteed since each year's funding would be subject to appropriations. There may be a need for the federal government to save money, but not feeding hungry

children and their families is a poor place to start.

Sincerely,

DR. A. WAYNE LORD,
National Peanut Council Chairman,
Southco Commodities.

AMENDMENT NO. 2562

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in opposition to the Ashcroft amendment on food stamps.

For the second straight day we are being asked to launch an attack on the Food Stamp Program. Once again I want to restate that Democrats support real reform of food stamps, not an effort to take food away from people. This amendment block-grants food stamps and in the process denies a safety net for kids. Once we turn this program into a block grant we end our commitment to feed all those children who fall victim to the next recession.

I am serious about reforming this program. I am pleased that Maryland has lead the country in introducing ways to cut down on fraud by going to an electronic system. Democrats have included reform of food stamps in our welfare reform bill. We included increased civil and criminal forfeiture for grocers who violate the Food Stamp Act. We tell stores that they must re-apply for the Food Stamp Program so that we make sure that fraud is not happening. Retailers who have already been disqualified from the WIC Program are disqualified from food stamps. We encourage States to enact their own reforms including the use of an electronic card and a picture ID. Democrats don't stop there. We are willing to require able-bodied people to work.

Mr. President, the fight here is over food, not fraud. This amendment would take the current system and throw it out. After we eliminate the current system we then turn it over to State governments. There are no guarantees in this amendment that States will not create their own bureaucratic wasteland. No guarantees that money going for food won't be diverted to nonnutrition needs. If we block-grant food stamps, what guarantees U.S. taxpayers that the dollars going for food stamps won't be converted to fund other programs in the next recession? What guarantees do we have that these nutrition funds won't become a bailout fund for some politically vulnerable Governor?

Mr. President, I repeat, I am for welfare reform—all Democrats are. That is why we worked hard at a real reform bill. That bill includes reforms to the Food Stamp Program. This amendment replaces reform with regression. Regression back to a time when we did not commit our Nation to a goal of feeding hungry people. It is time we focused our attention back on reform. We can do that by voting down this amendment.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time, and I ask once again for clarification of how much time remains to the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has 5 minutes; the Senator from Missouri has 8 minutes 15 seconds.

Mr. LUGAR. I thank the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If no one yields time, the time will be deducted equally from both sides.

Mr. LUGAR addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. I yield myself as much time as I may require for a concluding statement. I see no other Senators wishing to speak on this subject on our side.

Mr. President, let me just state the case for retaining the welfare bill in front of us, the leadership bill, which permits block granting to States but does not demand it.

First of all, the mandatory block grant would subject poor children, families, and elderly people to serious risks during economic downturns.

Second, the formula for distributing funds would be inequitable and would penalize large numbers of States, especially those with expanding population.

Third, the Agriculture Committee, which I chair, would have to make deeper cuts in farm programs or the school lunch or other child nutrition programs because the amounts in the Ashcroft amendment are not as great a cut as the ones that we have already made. There is a discrepancy of over \$3 billion as we calculate it.

Fourth, the amendment would likely lead to sharp reductions in food purchases and nutritional well-being and would injure the food and agricultural sectors of our economy.

Fifth, the bill denies food stamps to indigent, elderly, and disabled people who do not meet the work requirements.

Sixth, the amendment allows States to withdraw all State funds used to administer the Food Stamp Program and substitute Federal funds for them.

Seventh, the amendment would widen disparity among States and intensify a race to the bottom.

Eighth, Mr. President, it would weaken the safety net for children throughout the country.

And, finally, the amendment could increase fraud even though the desire, obviously, of the proponents is to limit fraud. There is no guarantee that States, starting from scratch in a complex program, would enjoy a situation of a greater fight against fraud than we experience in the Federal Government. Really, I think the evidence is to the contrary.

Mr. President, for all of these reasons, plus the obvious one, and that is a safety net of nutrition for Americans is vital and it should not be cast away in this amendment, I call for the defeat of the Ashcroft amendment and the retention of the safety net that we have currently.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ASHCROFT. May I inquire of the Chair the time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has 7 minutes remaining. The Senator from Indiana has 1 minute 45 seconds.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I am pleased to ask the Members of this body to vote in favor of endowing the States with the opportunity to substantially reform the welfare system, the single largest component of the welfare system, which touches almost 1 in every 10 Americans, and to do so by providing the resources to the States so that their legislatures and their Governors can make the resources available to truly needy individuals in a way that is far more efficient, is far less likely to consume additional resources. This is an idea which is welcomed by the States. Let me read from Governor Thompson's letter sent to my office.

Senator Ashcroft's amendment allows the maximum level of state flexibility while preserving the anticipated level of federal financial support envisioned in the leadership bill. In addition, the transferability of funds from the food stamp block grant to the AFDC block grant, which is common, is of critical importance to States like Wisconsin.

Wisconsin, as you know, has been a leading State in welfare reform. One of the reasons it is important that we have the kind of transferability and that we put AFDC and food stamps both into block grants is that, if you leave one Federal program as an entitlement without any limit as to the spending involved and you put another Federal program into a block grant, States can shift people from one area to another, pushing people into one area and elevating the Federal responsibility in order to curtail the responsibility of the State.

This would distort the allocation of resources. It simply would not be appropriate. We need to have the discipline and the management tools necessary for these programs to be administered appropriately and honestly. You could understand that if the AFDC Program, which is a shared program between the State and the Federal Government were to be block granted, and you maintained an entitlement in food stamps, that it would lead States to shift people from the limited area of State assistance to the unlimited area of the entitlement.

The distinguished Senator from Indiana has indicated that they hope to have savings of a substantial amount as a result of reforms that have been added to the program. Of course, we have seen these reforms year after year and time after time. We had major food stamp legislation in 1981 and then in 1988 and several times it has been adjusted in this decade. We have also seen what the chart shows: That food stamp consumption goes up and up.

It is anticipated that food stamps will rise. Under the Dole bill, food stamp consumption is supposed to go up. SSI is supposed to go up. It is anticipated that AFDC will remain low.

Surprise, surprise. The Dole bill, the leadership bill, provides that AFDC would be a block grant where the incentives would exist to keep the program down. And the anticipated rises here, frankly, by CBO are not rises that project any cost shifting, sending people from this category into these categories. That is not the reason for the rise, that is just another projection.

But if we make this a block grant program and it is limited and we say that these continue to be unlimited in entitlement programs, the natural tendency will be for States to start shifting clients from this client base over into these categories. As I suggested, these categories are likely to be increasing even further.

I believe that the people of this country have called upon us to reform welfare. To ignore the largest single welfare program in terms of people that it touches in this country and to say that it is off the table, and to call it some kind of a safety net, and to say we cannot trust local officials or State officials to be compassionate in the administration of these funds, and to say that we prefer the Federal bureaucracy, and that somehow there is greater compassion in this body and the Congress than there would be at State capitals, I think is to miss the point. The point should be that we should be focused on reforming the welfare system. We will not get great reform if we say to States, "Well, you can opt into a block grant but, on the other hand, if you do not opt into a block grant, we will let you continue in an entitlement program." "In an entitlement program" means you can continue to get money for all the people you can possibly find to qualify.

The incentives for cost reduction in that environment, the incentives for caseload are substantially lower than they would be in the setting of a block grant.

Not only would the incentives be substantially lower, but compliance costs, for complying with these 900 pages of regulations, still exist. You still find yourself in a system with about 24 percent friction in the system—the fraud, the abuse, the high administrative costs. It has been estimated that perhaps the leadership bill would take 90 pages out of the 900 pages of regulations. Some suggestion has been made, well, the States would not know how to come up to speed on this. After all, they could not do this in a couple weeks, they could not make this transition.

The truth of the matter is that States have had to administer this program covered over with the redtape of the Federal bureaucracy for years for the last quarter century. They know this program better than the Federal officials do. There are not that many food stamp employees in the country that are not State and local governmental employees, but they know what they are working under and they know

how it is burdening the system and they know the additional costs. It is that additional cost that has caused them to say, if we could have this program as a block grant, we could serve people far more carefully and far better.

So I believe that our responsibility is a responsibility to really reform welfare. Our responsibility is a responsibility to avoid cost shifting. Our responsibility is a responsibility to recognize that we have been working with a failed system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator his time has expired.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I urge the Members of this body to include, in real reform for welfare, reform of the biggest of the welfare programs, the Food Stamp Program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back all time?

Mr. LUGAR. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I ask unanimous consent that Senator GRAMM of Texas be added as a cosponsor of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). ARE THERE ANY OTHER SENATORS IN THE CHAMBER DESIRING TO VOTE?

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 64, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 412 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Abraham	Grams	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Grassley	Nickles
Bennett	Gregg	Packwood
Brown	Hatch	Roth
Coats	Helms	Santorum
Coverdell	Inhofe	Shelby
Craig	Kempthorne	Simpson
DeWine	Kyl	Smith
Dole	Lott	Stevens
Faircloth	Mack	Thomas
Frist	McCain	Thompson
Gramm	McConnell	Thurmond

NAYS—64

Akaka	Bumpers	Daschle
Baucus	Burns	Dodd
Biden	Byrd	Domenici
Bingaman	Campbell	Dorgan
Bond	Chafee	Exon
Boxer	Cochran	Feingold
Bradley	Cohen	Feinstein
Breaux	Conrad	Ford
Bryan	D'Amato	Glenn

Gorton	Kerry	Pressler
Graham	Kohl	Pryor
Harkin	Lautenberg	Reid
Hatfield	Leahy	Robb
Heflin	Levin	Rockefeller
Hollings	Lieberman	Sarbanes
Hutchison	Lugar	Simon
Inouye	Mikulski	Snowe
Jeffords	Moseley-Braun	Specter
Johnston	Moynihan	Warner
Kassebaum	Murray	Wellstone
Kennedy	Nunn	
Kerrey	Pell	

So the amendment (No. 2562) was rejected.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. FORD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2527

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of the Shelby amendment, No. 2527.

Who yields time on the amendment? If neither side yields time, time will be subtracted equally from both sides.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, we must have order. This is a matter of consequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Who yields time? The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, under a unanimous-consent agreement, I was slated to offer an amendment dealing with food stamps. I will not offer that amendment at this time. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 2527) was withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of three Moseley-Braun amendments, Nos. 2471, 2472, and 2473, on which there shall be a total of 2 hours of debate.

Who yields time? Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, may I inquire of my friend from Illinois, has one of the amendments been accepted?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. No. There are three amendments. I would like a moment to consult with the Senator from New York. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2471

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk which I now would like to have a vote on and discussion.

Essentially, this is the bottom-line child-protection amendment. It establishes a requirement that there be a voucher program for children, minor children, whose families would otherwise be eligible for assistance except for the time limit or other penalties, and where the parent has not complied with whatever the State rules are, the payment for that child's assistance could be made if necessary to a third party.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to take a good look at this amendment and to support it because, quite frankly, this amendment is one that can be supported by those who favor block grants and by those who oppose block grants. It also warrants support by those who favor State flexibility and by those who oppose State flexibility. This amendment speaks to maintaining a safety net for poor children.

This amendment essentially provides a floor below which no child in this United States will fall. Essentially, what it says is that children will not be penalized for the behavior of their parents. We have already had a lot of discussion in this forum about welfare reform, and the extent to which it affects the children. Quite frankly, the numbers make it very clear that out of the 14 million people in the United States who are currently receiving AFDC, 9 million of those people are children.

So essentially, if we penalize the majority, the children, for the behavior of their parents, I think we will have committed a great harm. It seems to me that our efforts to reform the welfare system should at a minimum do no harm to the children.

Mr. President, the United States, our country, has a child poverty rate of some 22 percent. That is one in five children who is poor. Our child poverty rate exceeds those of all the other industrialized nations. As we address the whole issue of poverty in the United States, and particularly child poverty, it seems to me that we ought to provide a minimum below which no child will fall, a minimum safety net that still allows the States to construct their own rules and requirements. A State can set up whatever kind of plan it wants to, at least within the parameters of the underlying legislation. A State will have the flexibility through the block grants to do as they will in terms of time limits, in terms of other requirements. But at a minimum, I think we should have consensus in this body that children caught in that situation will not be penalized for the failure of their parent to comply with the rule, whatever that State rule is, pertaining to welfare.

Mr. President, this amendment would ensure at a very minimum that every

State will provide essential support through a voucher for poor children whose parents and families no longer qualify for assistance. The amendment would allow the use of block grant funds for this purpose. So in that regard, it will allow for the maintenance of the flexibility that is in the underlying legislation again for the protection of children.

Mr. President, I ask for my colleagues' support of this legislation. I am prepared of course to entertain any questions regarding this.

Specifically, Mr. President, I would like to point to the notion that, with regard to the underlying legislation, there is a 5-year time limitation in terms of public assistance. It is unlikely, quite frankly, but there is the possibility—hopefully, it will not happen all that often, but there is at least a prospect—that we will have 6-year-old children walking around with no subsistence, with no support, with no help at all.

If, indeed, their parents fail to comply with the time limit in this bill or any other limitation that may be proposed by this legislation or the State in developing their plan, again I think we have to be mindful and cognizant of the fact that as Americans we have an obligation to all the children and that we would want to ensure that, at a minimum, there be an opportunity for those children who are left out to be fed, to be housed, and to receive adequate care.

The child-voucher approach will allow payment to a third party for essential services provided to minor children.

Mr. President, that, in substance, is the child-voucher amendment. I have on previous occasions discussed this issue in depth, regarding the operation of the welfare program with regard to children and the operation of the underlying legislation.

There is little question but that there ought to be some minimal standard. I believe the child-voucher amendment allows that, and so again I would entertain any questions about this legislation and ask for its favorable consideration.

I would also point out, Mr. President, this amendment has been analyzed and the CBO analysis is, "The amendment would not alter block grant levels and therefore would have no direct impact on Federal spending."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, could I inquire about how the time is being divided at this moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 48 minutes and 10 seconds remaining, and the opposition has 58 minutes and 52 seconds remaining.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the sake of time being treated fairly, if we do go back into a quorum, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided on both sides.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I think I am going to object to that.

I would say to my colleague, I am prepared to talk about this further.

Mr. LOTT. Fine.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. My own view was that I thought the opposition, if there is opposition—I hope there will not be opposition; it seems to me on this amendment we should reach consensus about it. But in the event there is opposition, I hope that the opposition would express itself in this period and would actually engage in dialogue about the importance of having again this child-voucher approach or some bottom-line protection for children. It seems to me to be an important enough subject to talk about it as opposed to just going into a quorum call.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Illinois will yield, that would be fine, if the Senator is prepared to speak further. And I am sure we will have some comment in opposition or some further discussion. But I just did not want us to be in quorum call with the time being counted just against this side. If the Senator would like to speak, that will resolve the problem, and then I am sure we will begin to ask questions and have dialogue.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. All right, I will continue then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, a lot of what I have to say about this particular amendment is in reiteration of what I said the other day. And, again, I would call my colleagues' attention to the significance of having a bottom-line protection for children. If anything, this amendment says that we will do no harm by the children; that in order to get the conduct of the 4.6 million adults who are receiving public assistance, we will not hurt the 9 million children who may be caught up and not understand all the rules.

The children are not responsible for their parents not going to work. The children are not responsible for their parents not complying with the family cap. The children are not responsible for their parents not abiding by the rules. The children have no way of fighting back or even challenging a State's decision to construct a program in one way or the other.

In light of the fact that what we are doing with this reform effort is setting up 50 different assistance systems—that is essentially what is going on—by devolving from the national program

under the Social Security Act for public assistance, we are allowing the States to craft their own programs, and so a child living in one State or another may well wind up really the victim, if you will, of an accident of geography.

It seems to me that at a minimum we ought to be able to say, as part of our national commitment as Americans, we are not going to allow a child to go homeless; we are not going to allow a child to go hungry; we are not going to allow a child in any State to be subject to the vicissitudes of misfortune, or, alternatively, to an accident of geography, and that we will provide a minimal safety net under which children can be cared for.

This issue is actually one of the more troubling aspects of this whole debate—the question of what about the children, what do we do about the children in the final analysis.

Earlier in the debate about welfare reform, the question was raised by some: Well, what happens if the parents do not comply with the rules? Then what do you do with the children? The suggestion was even made by some that you put them in orphanages.

We do not yet have the orphanages. We do not yet have any alternatives for these babies who may well be left homeless and hungry, with no subsistence at all if their parents get cut off of welfare.

I raised the issue with my colleagues the other day about the notion that while it is being touted as a new approach to public assistance, really this is an old approach; what we are doing here has happened before in this country.

I put into the RECORD this article from the Chicago History magazine called "Friendless Foundlings and Homeless Half Orphans," and it talked about the situation in our country before we had a national safety net for children, what happened there.

What we found was that, depending on the State of residence, depending on where the child lived, the different States responded to the issue of dependent children in different ways. And, in many instances, the children were left to their own devices—sleeping in the streets, in some instances, a parent—and that is where the term "homeless half orphan," which I never heard before I read this article, came from. The women in some instances could not support them and would take to the doors of a church or orphanage and just leave them there for the winter so as to provide their babies with some way to live when times were really hard.

I do not think we want to go back to that in this country. As a matter of fact, I am certain of it. And I do not sense frankly that even the architects of this bill want to go move this country backward. The architects of this legislation, however, have often said, well, we are just going to take our chances because the States are going

to do no harm to the children. States will not leave the children homeless and hungry, and the States will not make decisions, the Governors will not make decisions that will hurt the children any more than we in the Senate would want to hurt the children.

And I am prepared reluctantly to take the gamble that we all will take with the passage of this legislation, that that is the case. But I have to raise the question whether or not, as a national community, we are willing to take that gamble on the backs of the children, whether or not we are willing to take that gamble without regard at all to any protection for them, any bottom line for them.

Would it not be in our own interests as a national community, all of us, because we are all residents of various States, residents of the State that sent us here in the first instance, we are residents of local governments as well, but would not it make sense for us to have some bottom level below which no child—no child—will be jeopardized? That is the only question. Are we prepared to take a loser-risk-all kind of gamble, or are we willing to say with regard to the basics of subsistence issues for children—food, clothing, care, shelter—with regard to health, with regard to those very basic things, we are going to provide some level of support?

That is what this child voucher amendment does. It says to the States, you are free to do what you want to do in terms of constructing the parameters and the operation and the system for your program. You are absolutely free to do that. But at a minimum, you have got to provide that if a child winds up with nothing because that child's parent does not comply with the rules or does not fit into the program, that that child in the final analysis will be entitled to a voucher, the voucher is not for any adults, it is for that child, that 6-year-old, that 7-year-old, that 4-year-old even, that that child will be entitled to a voucher. Vouchers would go to a third party and it might well be an orphanage or might be somebody in the community or it might be some other system that the State establishes. We are not telling the States how to do this.

We are just telling them that there has to be this bottom-line protection and that they have an obligation to try to work out some system so that children will not fall below the level of care and subsistence that as a national community we believe is appropriate. We do not want to get to the point—and I do have the picture; I do not know if it is still here—that was demonstrated graphically in the article that talked about what we had in this country before we had a national safety net, a national commitment to safety for the children. We do not want to wind up with children sleeping in the streets and fending for themselves. This is actually a picture. This picture is not made up. And this is in the United States of America, let me point out.

This is not some foreign country, although we do, frankly, have pictures of foreign countries that do not have a child safety net and the situation of their children is dire in 1995. But this particular picture here which I would call the Chair's attention to, this is a fascinating article.

And if the Chair gets an opportunity, because I know, Mr. President, that you have a great interest in this subject, this article was written regarding turn-of-the-century America and the situation regarding child welfare in this country. This picture here was taken in Illinois, I say, in my own State, circa 1889. This is 1889.

Until the reform efforts of the late 19th century, the public largely ignored the plight of destitute children. Barefoot children wandering about the streets, boys selling newspapers, and "street arabs" sleeping on top of each other for warmth, were among the realities that forced charities to undertake measures to protect orphaned and abandoned children.

Again, I cannot imagine anybody in this Chamber wanting to go back to this type of child poverty. I do not think anybody wants to get to this again. But the only way we can keep this from happening this happening in this country is to provide for a basic safety net. And that is exactly what the child voucher amendment does.

Mr. President, one of the other issues in terms of the analysis of S. 1120, the underlying legislation, that I thought ought to command and compel our attention are the issues of the number of children that might be kicked off, if you will, because their families did not comply with the rules, either the time limit or the family cap or whatever.

The estimates are that if the bill—I will quote—if the bill were fully implemented, the States would not be able to use Federal funds to support some 3.9 million children because those children are in families that have received AFDC for longer than 5 years. This analysis takes into account that 15 percent of the entire caseload will be exempt from the 5-year limit. If the States were to impose a 24-month time limit instead of a 60-month time limit, 9 million children would be denied assistance.

Now, Mr. President, those are not my numbers. Those are the numbers from HHS. And I think those are numbers that all of the authors of S. 1120, the authors of this plan, recognize to be true. This is not made up. And so the question becomes for all of us—do we really want to take the chance that some 3.9 million children will be left to be street urchins and left to their own devices because of the time limit operation in the bill? Or more to the point, if we change the time limit and impose some other requirements—or worse yet, the States could impose a time after 24 months—if that were to happen, as many as 9 million children would be denied assistance altogether? I, for one, do not believe that is a chance that any of the Members of this body want to take.

Certainly we have some philosophical disagreements about this legislation. There are disagreements about the many constituent parts of it. But on this, Mr. President, I believe there can be no disagreement that the children are deserving of our absolute commitment, and the children are deserving of some protection, and, in passing this legislation, we will provide a minimal level of protection. And I have proposed that the way we do that is to state for the record that the States should be required to establish a child voucher program so that those children would be eligible for assistance such as food, care, and shelter.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would like to say that this amendment, which is similar in nature to what Senator DASCHLE had offered in his substitute, really does violate the whole principle of ending welfare as we know it. What this amendment does is continue the entitlement to welfare benefits albeit in a different form. It is not cash, it is vouchers, still an entitlement, Federal dollars to families on welfare in perpetuity. There is no time limit. So this will, in effect, end the time limit.

Now, if we are serious—I would say that the President when he offered his bill a year ago in June, although he had some loopholes, he did have a time limit. And he did, after 5 years, under some circumstances, not many, unfortunately, but some circumstances actually end welfare in the sense that the cash assistance, voucher—no further entitlement under AFDC would be continued. And to suggest that if we provide in an entitlement just for children and not for the mother that somehow the children are going to get this money and the mother or father, whoever the custodial parent, is not going to get this—I do not know many 3-years-olds who fend for themselves. The money is going to go to the parents and it is going to be a support.

Now, I would say, under the Dole modified bill, we do continue to support that family with Medicaid, with food stamps, with housing if the family qualified for housing. About 25 percent of families on AFDC qualify for Federal housing assistance, whether it is section 8 or public housing. So all of those benefits continue. And all we are doing is saying, after 5 years, after we have given you intensive training under this bill—we believe there will be intensive worker training or retraining if necessary, 3 years of work opportunity—at some point the Federal contract with the family who is in need ends. And what we are going to say is we will continue to provide food and medical care and other things if you chose not to go to work.

But at some point we are going to say we are not going to continue to

provide assistance in the form of cash, or in the case of the Senator from Illinois's amendment, a voucher, which is the equivalent of cash to provide for other services that cash would be used for.

So to me this is just a backdoor attempt to continue the welfare entitlement in perpetuity. And if you understand the whole motivation, the reason the President in such dramatic fashion in 1992 stood squarely behind the idea of ending welfare as we know it, that whole concept of ending welfare as we know it was based on a time limit, a 5-year time limit on welfare. You cannot end welfare if you continue welfare, and this continues welfare. If we adopt this amendment, anyone who stands here and says, "We are ending welfare as we know it" is not telling the truth, because you continue the entitlement. It is very important that this amendment, although I understand and respect the Senator from Illinois and her desire to protect children, I suggest that you can go to cities across this country and find pictures of children in, unfortunately, the same situation today. Usually, they may not even be out on the street, because in many of these neighborhoods, they certainly would not be safe out on the street because of the violence and the degradation that we have seen in the communities that they live in.

We go back to the whole point that we are here today, and the whole point we are here today is the current system is failing the very children it is attempting to help. To suggest we are going to help children by continuing dependency, by continuing the welfare system, in a sense, with this entitlement stretching on in perpetuity, I think, just belies the fact that the system is failing.

I appreciate her concern for children, and I think everyone here who stands behind the Dole bill has that same concern for children. We honestly believe, and I think rightfully believe, that ending the entitlement to welfare, requiring work, moving people off a system which says, "We are going to maintain you in poverty," to a system that says, "We are going to move you out of poverty," that is a dynamic, time-certain system, is the way to really change the dynamics for the poor in America today and for the children in America today.

It is a philosophical difference. Many times I go back home and I have town meetings. People at my town meetings say, "Why don't you folks just work it out? You are always playing politics down here. Why don't you folks come together?"

I say to the Senator from Illinois, we did come together on one of her amendments. She was to offer three. One of the amendments we accepted. We accepted her amendment on a demonstration project, called JOLI, \$25 million. We understand that that system is experiencing some success, so we agreed to accept one of her three amendments.

The other two we have very different policy differences. This is not politics. They are fundamental differences of opinion as to whether welfare is working with a system of endless entitlement, or whether we need, as the President has stated, to put some certainty of time, some commitment to the individual that welfare will be there to help for a discrete period of time to intensively try to turn someone's life around with the expectation and requirement that at some point you will move off and the social contract between the Government, whether it is the State or whether the State, hopefully under the Ashcroft provision of the Dole amendment, moves it to the private sector and has a private entity more involved in provision of welfare, whatever the case may be, we believe that that dynamic process is so possible under this amendment, that is so different than what we have seen in the past, that I am hopeful that we can defeat this amendment, keep that time-limit provision in place and move forward with this bill.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, first, I want to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. He is correct, the job training demonstration amendment has been accepted, and I am delighted to have been able to work with him in a bipartisan fashion.

Second, I say to him that this is not a back door around the time limit. If anything—and I want to make this point because I think it is very important to our colleagues' analysis of the child voucher amendment—if anything, this amendment is no more and no less than an insurance policy for the children.

We know there is going to be a time limit. That is written in the legislation. We know there are going to be work requirements. There may well be a family cap. We know all these things are happening, but there are so many uncertainties in this legislation, not the least of which is whether or not the parents will be able to find jobs after 5 years.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated that only 10 to 15 States could potentially meet the fiscal year 2000 work participation requirements in this legislation. They go on to say that because the bill provides States with significant flexibility to set policies that may affect caseloads, the estimate contains a high degree of uncertainty.

To the extent that there is uncertainty here, are we really prepared to say we are going to make 6-, 7-, and 8-year-olds pay for any failure of our analysis? Are we going to make them pay for the sins of their parents? Are we going to make them pay for our failure to adequately put together a system that addresses the issues that go to poverty?

The Senator from Pennsylvania, when he starts talking about this

issue, starts talking about crime and violence in the communities. There are a lot of issues involved in this whole question of welfare. But I say to my colleagues once again, welfare does not stand alone in a vacuum. It is only a response to a larger issue, which is poverty, child poverty.

Our Nation has tried different approaches to the issue of dealing with child poverty and destitute children, and now we are about to try another one. We are about to try the "ending of welfare as we know it." Well, Mr. President, it is just like anything else. We all know, for example, that we are going to die, but most of us have the sense to go ahead and get an insurance policy anyway.

The fact of the matter is that this is going to change. Will we have an insurance policy for children? I submit that we should. I hope that my colleagues will agree with me, and I urge your support for the child voucher amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. President, before I do, Senator LIEBERMAN has requested to be added as a cosponsor on the child voucher amendment. I ask unanimous consent that he be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators MURRAY and MIKULSKI be added as cosponsors to the child voucher amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. And I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the child voucher amendment.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I understand we will stack the votes on these amendments; therefore, I want to move on to the second amendment in this series and get that resolved as well.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority leader.

THE WAR ON DRUGS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, earlier today, the Department of Health and Human Services released the results of its 1994 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse. According to the survey, marijuana use among teenagers has nearly doubled since 1992, after 13 straight years of decline.

This troubling fact confirms what we already know: Today, our children are

smoking more dope, smoking and snorting more cocaine, and smoking and shooting up more heroin than at any time in recent memory.

Unfortunately, while drug use has gone up during the past 2½ years, the Clinton administration has sat on the sidelines, transforming the war on drugs into a full-scale retreat.

The President has abandoned the moral bully pulpit, cut the staff at the drug Czar's office by nearly 80 percent, and appointed a surgeon general who believes the best way to fight illegal drugs is to legalize them. He has presided over an administration that has de-emphasized the interdiction effort, allowed the number of Federal drug prosecutions to decline, and overseen a source-country effort that the General Accounting Office describes as badly managed and poorly coordinated.

Mr. President, illegal drug use declined throughout the 1980's and early 1990's, so we know how to turn this dangerous problem around. It means sending a clear and unmistakable cultural message that drug use is wrong, stupid, and life-threatening. It means beefing up our interdiction and drug enforcement efforts. It means strengthening our work in the source countries by making clear that good relations with the United States require serious efforts to stop drug exports.

And, yes, it means leadership at the top, starting with the President of the United States.

Today's survey is yet another warning for America. We must renew our commitment to the war on drugs, with or without President Clinton as an ally.

I yield the floor.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2472

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment 2472 is now pending.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, this is kind of an interesting place to pick up, following the child voucher amendment. This, again, is separate and distinct from that. If anything, the child voucher amendment really is the most important in terms of the children.

This next amendment goes to the adults. What do we do about the parents? In that regard, as we know the underlying legislation calls for States to provide work experience, assistance in finding employment and other work preparation activities, section 402(A)(2) of the bill.

One of the uncertainties in the legislation, uncertainties that CBO spoke to, that many of the speakers on this issue have noted, is that the States have not yet geared up to do this. Only a few will be ready to move forward.

We have the example of Wisconsin. I understand in a couple of counties there they have already moved to a work assistance kind of program, an

initiative. Other States have tried it. Under the Family Support Act, those kinds of work-training experiments and initiatives are encouraged.

The point is that a lot of States have not yet moved to that. The question is whether or not the States will actually do so, whether they will actually move to employment training, work preparation, work experience, assistance in finding employment for individuals. Again, the CBO estimates that there is not enough funding in the bill to do that.

This legislation says that the State should not just kick somebody off of assistance—this is as to the adults, not the children, as to the adults—the States should not kick the adults off unless they have provided work assistance.

Now, HHS has estimated that under the leadership plan, some 2.9 million people would be required to participate in a work plan under the plan. That is fine. The point is that in terms of the number of dollars to meet that participation rate there is not enough, it is also estimated we need 161 percent more dollars than presently provided in the legislation.

Clearly, there is a dissonance, a gap in the interesting goal and our intent to provide work and job training assistance and our dollars that will flow to do so. We do not know how that will come out. It creates a great uncertainty.

It seems to me that, again, as a bottom line—as to the adults—we ought to make it clear that States should not just kick people off without providing them with some assistance.

I encourage my colleagues to take a good look at this. Again, we have the numbers from CBO regarding whether or not their respective States will be able to meet the work requirements and not have a penalty. Most of the States will not. It is estimated only 10 to 15 States already are geared up sufficiently to provide the kind of work assistance that the bill, the underlying legislation, calls for.

All this amendment says is that States must provide those services in terms of job assistance and the like if they are going to cut people off at a time certain, whether it is 5 years, 2 years, 1 year, 6 months, or whatever the time limit is.

Again, this State responsibility amendment, if anything, goes to providing the parents with some comfort level that in the event there are no jobs in their area, in the event the State has not been able to get them into some kind of gainful employment, that they will not thereby lose their ability to feed themselves and to provide for their children.

I point out, Mr. President, also that this amendment only requires that the States deliver the services to those recipients that the State decides need to have those services. That is not to say they have to provide everybody with